	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/632,563	CHENG ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sathyanarayan Pannala	2164	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *20 December 2007*.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-10,12,14-16,18-23,25,27-30 and 32* is/are pending in the application.
   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☐ Claim(s) *1-10,12,14-16,18-23,25,27-30 and 32* is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
   a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)
1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. *attached* .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   Applicant initiated the interview on 4/16/2008 and asked for response to all his arguments in the response to non-final Office Action and Restarting the Response period. Based on the Examiner discussion with SPE, SPE verbally approved to restart the response period. Therefore, the finality of the previous Office Action mailed on 4/2/2008 has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. **This Office action will Restart the Response period**.

2.   Applicants Amendment filed on 12/20/2007 has been entered with amended claims 16, 18-23, newly added claims 33-35 and cancelled claim 17. In this Office Action, claims 1-10, 12, 14-16, 18-23, 25, 27-30 and 32 are pending.

Claim Objections

3.   Claim 14-23 and 25 are objected to because of the following informalities: Applicant included in claim 14 phrased as "operable" and it is not a definite recitation and will not have any patentability weight. Therefore, claims 14-23 and 25 fall under non-statutory subject matter. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of

matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the

conditions and requirements of this title.

5.   Claims 27-30 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101, because none of the

claims are directed to statutory subject matter. Independent claim 27 merely claiming

functional descriptive material, i.e., abstract ideas. Even when a claim that recites a

computer that solely calculates a mathematical formula or a computer disk that solely

stores a mathematical formula is not directed to the type of statutory subject matter

eligible for patent protection. The claims are not producing useful, concrete and

tangible results. See Diehr, 450 U.S. at 186 and Gottschalk v. Benson, 409 U.S. 63,

71-72 (1972).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set

forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

        This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims

under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was

commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the

contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and

invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in

order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e),

(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7.   Claims 1-10, 12, 14-23, 25, 27-30 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Dorsett Jr. (US Patent 6,658,429) hereinafter Dorsett, and in

view of Woolston et al. (US Patent 6,856,967) hereinafter Woolston.

8.   As per independent claims 1, 14, 27, Dorsett teaches a method implementing

techniques for processing from chemical experimentation for or on a library of materials

or a subset of such a library of materials (col. 2, lines 39-45 and col. 5, lines 28-30).

Dorsett teaches the claimed, retrieving data from an identified database object, the

database object data including attribute data for the database object (Fig. 1, col.5,

lines 31-38). Dorsett teaches the claimed, retrieving metadata from the database

object, the metadata including a name, a data type, and a value for each attribute of the

database object (Fig. 1, col. 9, lines 26-43 and col. 13, lines 14-19). Dorsett teaches

the claimed, creating and storing an electronic file for the database object in a

generalized data format constructing a generalized data structure for the attribute data

using the metadata (Fig. 1, col. 9, lines 20-30). Dorsett teaches the claimed, parsing

the attribute data into the generalized data structure (Fig. 1, col. 19, lines 18-21).

Dorsett teaches the claimed, exporting the electronic file to one or more external

systems for display using an application residing on the one or more external systems

(Fig. 1, col. 20,   lines 40-43).

Dorsett does not explicitly teach an application dealing with bid price. However, Woolston teaches the claimed, (Fig. 12, col. 16, line 64 to col. 17, line 1). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Woolston's teachings would have allowed Dorsett's method to provide a consistent navigational or taxonomy scheme to navigate and find pricing information in a heterogeneous computing environment and found on the internet (col. 2, lines 40-45).

9.   As per dependent claims 2, 15, 28, Dorsett teaches the claimed, Dorsett teaches the claimed, receiving a request for database object data associated with a particular database object (Fig. 1, col. 7, lines 35-43).

10.   As per dependent claims 3, 16, 29, Dorsett teaches the claimed, retrieving database object data comprises retrieving opportunity header data and data for one or more opportunity listings (col. 2, line 55 to col. 3, line 10).

11.   As per dependent claims 4, 17, Dorsett teaches the claimed, the database object data includes data related to a desired commercial transaction (col. 2, lines 45-54).

12.   As per dependent claims 5, 18, Dorsett teaches the claimed, the opportunity header data includes an opportunity type and an opportunity identifier (col. 3, lines 40-54).

13.   As per dependent claims 6, 19, Dorsett teaches the claimed, the data for one or

more opportunity listings includes product data, the product data associated with a

product to be obtained as a result of the desired commercial transaction (col. 3,

lines 40-54).

14.   As per dependent claims 7, 20, Dorsett teaches the claimed, the data for one or

more opportunity listings includes service data, the service data associated with a

service to be obtained as a result of the desired commercial transaction (col. 3,

lines 40-54).

15.   As per dependent claims 8, 21, 30, Dorsett teaches the claimed, retrieving

database object data comprises retrieving response data associated with the one or

more opportunity listings (Fig. 1, col. 7, lines 57-61).

16.   As per dependent claims 9, 22, Dorsett does not explicitly teach an application

dealing with bid price. However, Woolston teaches the claimed, the response data

includes a bid amount corresponding to one or the one or more opportunity listings

(Fig. 12, col. 16 line 64 to col. 17, line 7).   Thus, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the invention, to have combined

the teachings of the cited references because Woolston's teachings would have allowed

Dorsett's method to provide a consistent navigational or taxonomy scheme to navigate

and find pricing information in a heterogeneous computing environment and found on the internet (col. 2, lines 40-45).

17.   As per dependent claims 10, 23, Dorsett teaches the claimed, retrieving database object data includes executing one or more series query language statements according to a persistence layer implementation (Fig. 1, col. 9, lines 18-22).

18.   As per dependent claims 11, Dorsett does not explicitly teach an application dealing with bid price. However, Woolston teaches the claimed, the attribute data includes data for a first set of static attributes and a first set of dynamic attributes (Fig. 12, col. 16, line 64 to col. 17, line 1). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Woolston's teachings would have allowed Dorsett's method to provide a consistent navigational or taxonomy scheme to navigate and find pricing information in a heterogeneous computing environment and found on the internet (col. 2, lines 40-45).

19.   As per dependent claims 12, 25, 32, Dorsett teaches the claimed, the generalized data structure conforms to extensible markup language (XML) format (Fig. 1, col. 9, lines 50-55).

20.   As per dependent claims 16, Dorsett does not explicitly teach an application

dealing with bid price. However, Woolston teaches the claimed, retrieving database

object data comprises retrieving opportunity header data associated with an and data

for one or more opportunity listings to bid on a possible commercial transaction between

a purchaser of goods or services and a supplier of the goods or services, the retrieved

data including opportunity data associated with the opportunity to bid and listing data

associated with the goods or services corresponding to the possible commercial

transaction (Fig. 12, col. 16, line 64 to col. 17, line 1). Thus, it would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the invention, to

have combined the teachings of the cited references because Woolston's teachings

would have allowed Dorsett's method to provide a consistent navigational or taxonomy

scheme to navigate and find pricing information in a heterogeneous computing

environment and found on the internet (col. 2, lines 40-45).

Response to Arguments

21.   Applicant's arguments filed on 12/20/2007 have been fully considered but they

are not persuasive and details as follows:

a)   Applicant's arguments regarding claims 14-23 and, 25, rejection under 35

U.S.C. 101 is not persuasive. However, these claims are objected instead of the

rejection. The other claims 27-30 and 32 rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101 is

maintained.

b)   Applicants' argument stated as "Substantively, Applicants continue to

argue that neither Dorsett, nor Woolston, nor the combination of Dorsett and

Woolston discloses or suggests independent claims 1, 14 or 27" (see page 13,

paragraph three).

        In response to Applicants' argument, Examiner respectfully disagrees,

because Applicant combined few dependent claims with independent claims in

the earlier amendment and based on the amendment, Examiner combined two

references. These two references combined teach all claims and their limitations.

Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

c)   Applicants' argument filed on 5/14/2007 regarding rejection of claims

under 35 U.S.C. 103 stated as "Dorsett does not disclose or suggest many of the

limitations set forth in Applicants' claim 1. Firstly, Dorsett does not even relate to,

as is now recited in the preamble of claim 1, a 'computer-implemented method

for exporting information created in a first system using a first application to one

or more external systems'"

        In response to Applicants' argument, Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Because, Dorsett do teach a method of implementing techniques for processing

from chemical experimentation for or on a library of materials or a subset of such

a library materials (see Fig. 1, col. 2, lines 39-45). Further, computer system 110

connected to other computer systems by a computer network such as a local

area network, wide area net work or the internet (Fig. 1, col. 5, lines 28-30).

d)   Applicants' argument filed on 5/14/2007 regarding rejection of claims

under 35 U.S.C. 103 stated as 'Dorsett does not disclose or suggest, as recited

in claim 1, a method that includes "retrieving data from an identified database

object, the database object data including attribute data for the database object,

the attributes including at least one static attribute with a predefined data

structure and at least one dynamic attribute that is dynamically configured by a

user.'"

In response to Applicants' argument, Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Because, Dorsett do teach this limitation at (Fig. 1, col. 5, lines 31-38). Further,

the static attributes are taught at (col. 13, lines 14-15) and dynamic attributes are

taught at (col. 13, lines 19-30).

e)   Applicants' argument filed on 5/14/2007 regarding rejection of claims

under 35 U.S.C. 103 stated as "Dorsett does not disclose or suggest, in

particular, the need for 'creating and storing an electronic file for the database

object in a generalized data format by constructing a generalized data structure

from the attribute using the metadata, and parsing the attribute data into the

generalized data structure', as recited in claim 1."

In response to Applicants' argument, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Because, Dorsett do teach a this limitation first part "creating ... using the metadata" at (Fig. 1, col. 9, lines 20-30). The second part "parsing the attribute ... data structure" at (Fig.1, col. 19, lines 18-21).

f)   Applicants' argument filed on 12/20/2007 regarding rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. 103 stated as "the Examiner 's response mischaracterizes Applicant's previous amendments.

In response to Applicants' argument, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Because, there is no mischaracterization has been occurred, now clearly explained in c) to f) paragraphs. In fact, Applicant has been expecting word to word mapping, even though Applicant's claims are not fully supportive word by word and the same has been brought to Applicant during the interview held on 4/16/2008.

g)   Applicants' argument filed on 12/20/2007 regarding rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. 103 stated as "the Examiner asserts that the second reference teaches... But the examiner did not provide in the rejection an explanation of how the second reference addresses deficiencies of the first reference."

In response to Applicants' argument, Examiner respectfully disagrees. It has been clearly sated in the rejection, what limitations Dorsett do teach and the limitations are not explicitly taught by Dorsett. As well as what limitations and claims the second reference (Woolston) teaches with a suitable motivation have been provided in the rejection.

Therefore, examiner feels that the prior art on record, the two references

combined do teach all claims and their limitations.

Restriction Based on Original Presentation

22.   Newly submitted claims 33-35 directed to an invention that is independent or

distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons:

a)   Original claims are directed to Database Processing and they are

classified under 707/1.

b)   Newly added claims have the distinct subject matter and they are directed

to Inter-program Communication or Inter-process communication (IPC), classified as

705/81. The distinct subject matter included in claims is: Electronic Negotiation --

Automated electrical financial or business practice or management arrangement.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented

invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for

prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 33-35 are withdrawn from consideration

as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP §

821.03.

Conclusion

23.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Sathyanarayan Pannala whose telephone number is

(571) 272-4115. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov.

Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the

Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Sathyanarayan Pannala
Primary Examiner

srp
June 1, 2008